



**TOWN OF LOOMIS**  
**ACTION MINUTES**  
**WORKSHOP AND SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING**  
**LOOMIS TOWN COUNCIL**  
**LOOMIS DEPOT**  
**5775 HORSESHOE BAR ROAD**  
**LOOMIS, CA 95650**

**THURSDAY**

**SEPTEMBER 23, 2010**

**7:00 P.M.**

Note: These are action minutes only. An audio copy of the meeting can be requested at Town Hall.

**CALL TO ORDER** Call to order by Mayor Liss at 7:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Present:

Mayor Liss  
Councilmember Kelley  
Councilmember Morillas  
Councilmember Scherer  
Councilmember Ucovich

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** This time is reserved for those in the audience who wish to address the Town Council on subjects that are not on the Agenda. The audience should be aware that the Council may not discuss details or vote on non-agenda items. Your concerns may be referred to staff or placed on the next available agenda. Please note that comments from the public will also be taken on any item on the agenda. The time allotted to each speaker is five minutes. There was no public comment.

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA** A motion was made to adopt the Agenda. On motion by Councilmember Ucovich, seconded by Councilmember Morillas and passed by voice vote.

**WORKSHOP**

**7:00 PM to 8:00 PM**

**PLANNING COMMISSION**

Present:

Commission Chair Thew  
Vice Chair Arisman  
Commissioner Fettke  
Commissioner Obranovich  
Commissioner Wilson

**PARK, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE COMMITTEE**

Present:

Committee Chair Calvert	Vice Chair Miller
Member Beck	Member Seers
Member Emert	Member Seth
Member Knisley	Member Wallis

1. **Park, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan Review with Planning Commission and Parks, Recreation and Open Space Committee**

The Master Plan is intended to provide the town of Loomis with a comprehensive view of its park, open space and recreation resources and to develop a practical program for financing the acquisition, development, operation and maintenance of a sound parks, open space, and recreation program that will serve the residents of Loomis until the year 2030.

**Recommended action:** Review Master Plan and comments received to date and such comments that come up in the course of the review.

**Public comment:**

Recess at 8:25 p.m. to 8:35 p.m.

**CONVENE SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING**

**8:15 PM to adjourn**

Council convened into a Special Meeting at 8:35 p.m.

## BUSINESS

### 1. Park, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan Comments

The Master Plan comments require Council approval so that the consultant can complete the public review draft and submit a final draft for Council approval.

**Recommended action:** Review Master Plan and comments and:

- A. Approve the edits section making any final changes Council desires
- B. Receive and file the opinion section
- C. Review the various comments in the section requiring Council action and make determinations as the Council desires item by item

#### **Public comment:**

Council discussed the 12 items and agreed upon the following:

1. *Page 43 – G-5, "...five or more parcels...." Comment indicated that a 5 lot subdivision is not enough parcels and that a park would be too small. Needs to be larger subdivisions, No minimum parcel number given with this comment.*

When there are 30 to 40 homes built than require land for a park and for smaller subdivisions locate a park in a planning area when enough money comes in from park fees.

2. *Page 45 – Recommended to add an OS-9: "Would like the Town to purchase potential sites for future parks."*

Discussed in item 1 what number 2 is trying to address and add the "Town shall not go into debt."

3. *Page 40 - #2, at the bottom of the page should be reworded: "Institute a tax....."*

Delete "increase in." This is addressed in the Implementation on page 47 #6 but delete reference to "quarter cent" and "\$60" and "an Open Space." To read as follows: Commission a scientific public opinion survey of the Town's residents on parks, recreation, and open space issues and gauge public opinion regarding the formation of a District funded by a sales tax increase and/or an annual parcel tax.

4. *Would like to use the lower percentage (45% is too much).*

Keep percentage as is.

No public comment on items 1, 2, 3, 4,

A motion was made to approve the above recommendations for items 1, 2, and 3. On motion by Councilmember Scherer, seconded by Councilmember Morillas and passed by voice vote.

A motion was made to approve the above recommendation for Item 4. On motion by Councilmember Scherer, seconded by Councilmember Morillas and passed by voice vote, with Councilmember Ucovich voting no (4/1).

5. *Section 6 does not talk about Antelope Creek and the Unnamed Creek (Sierra College Boulevard to the Village at Loomis)*

Add unnamed creek to plan.

6. *For Implementation Section, put emphasis on "action." Add a couple of section items such as:*

- 1. *Identify areas where Loomis wants Parks and/or open space areas.*
- 2. *Identify potential parcels that are on the market for parks and/or open space areas*
- 3. *Identify and apply for suitable grants as soon as possible.*
- 4. *"Implementation Section does not fully communicate recommended policies and programs (Section 6). Suggest a bullet point list of: "Do these park projects," as pulled out of Section 6 and make sure Section 6 includes "trails information."*

Delete item 2.

Following are comments given in the workshop to be added:

- Identify the needs per the planning area rather than by parcel
- take big area and say there should be a park but don't identify a specific site
- trails policy, why not just refer to the other document
- all developments need a connectivity plan to connect subdivisions (add to page 47 implementation plan)
- Najidian project on Berg Lane was an opportunity to connect Frost, Berg and Wine Way
- trails connecting all the parks, recreation areas and open space in Loomis as practical as a goal beyond the trails master plan

- require property to have such trails as easements particularly along stream corridors that have not been developed (add to page 47 implementation plan)
- swim pool used by swim team and Loomis Basin Dolphins after summer otherwise pool is shut after Labor Day
- need agreements with schools on public use of facilities
- Town doesn't have a recreation department so haven't needed detailed agreements
- Town can't presently afford recreation department
- at County Park you call January 1 to book date for event
- can't book exercise
- question need of recreation program
- Page 39 overview says we have arrangements with schools not accurate, add in this section a reference to joint use agreements and where appropriate in maintenance, administration funding
- need more specifics on what is possible
- jogging and tennis are not group things so in a joint agreement could say facility available to public use when school is not in session
- work with Del Oro first for an agreement
- elementary schools actually better working with public
- news articles and postings would be good once agreements are made
- don't get into a scheduling schools
- individuals should not be at the end of the line to use school facilities
- schedule open time
- page 4, no recreation department in Town because County did not give Loomis a percentage of the tax dollar at incorporation to have that service
- child safety should be addressed in an agreement
- after school there are many scheduled activities

**7. This Master Plan needs to include verblage on linking trails to park and open space areas.**

The comments in Item 6 address item 7 also.

**8. R-3. Suggest adding at the end "beyond the summer program" – if that is what's meant- since we already have the summer program use. Or another meaning?**

On page 39 under the "Overview" mention that Joint Use Agreements with schools are part of our park plan; page 44, under Section C Recreation Program Policies – public access to school facilities needs to be specifically addressed in joint use agreements; delete reference to "strong" working relationship on page 44 C.R-3;

R-3 to be modified to: Build upon the Town's working relationship with the School Districts to expand the programs and facilities that would be open to the Town's residents at their facilities.

No public comment for items 5-8.

A motion was made to approve the above recommendations for items 5-8. On motion by Councilmember Ucovich, seconded by Councilmember Scherer and passed by voice vote.

**9. OS-7 I cannot support a jump to 75% Open Space for clustering without substantial study of the issue and public hearings. This is a huge change from our current Zoning Ordinance's 40, 50 and 60% requirement, depending on lot size zoning. This figure looks picked from the air. Are there studies and examples to back it up? Besides the homes, roads and infrastructure also take a portion of the land. Will people really want to live that crammed together in our larger parcel areas of Loomis? Will they be willing to pay for the ongoing expense of maintaining such large open spaces for their subdivision? Will the public accept such dense clustering in our larger parcel areas? There are far too many unanswered questions for me to support this change without significant further study. (It would be acceptable to call for the Town to consider increasing the Open Space requirement for clustered development.)**

Delete the words "at least 75%."

**10. Under "Existing Open Space Resources" on page 29 is the phrase "outlined below are some of the existing open space resources that are presently enjoyed by our community." While the requirements of Quimby don't apply to open space, we have set the goal of 5 acres/1000 people. Counting the easements on Montserrat to claim we've met our goal is just as inappropriate as counting St. Francis Woods, which seems to have disappeared from the list. All the land in both neighborhoods is privately owned. There will be no community enjoyment other than the horse trail along the main road. There won't even be enjoyment by the neighbors, as there is no neighborhood access either. It's reasonable to count the horse trail, but not the private lots. It's like counting everyone's back yard as open space. If asked, I doubt Loomis residents would consider Montserrat their community open space, so is it appropriate for us to do so? Again, the questionable conclusion that we've exceeded our goal could be used as an excuse to ignore protecting more open space.**

This has already been covered.

No public comment.

A motion was made to approve the above recommendation for item 9. On motion by Councilmember Scherer, seconded by Councilmember Morillas and passed by voice vote.

**11. Under funding and Financing on page 46, suggest adding a mechanism for funding the skate park through community participation. The skate park will serve a small percentage of the citizens, and it would be appropriate for the kids to raise some of the money. Why not have a match program? The town would match whatever the kids raise. They would be likely to have more of a sense of ownership when they've had to work for it, and thus would probably help keep the park clean and safe. Safety is an established concern about the skate park.**

Let the High School know that we are open to senior projects, open opportunities for public funding, and opportunities for school uses including plays from McLaughlin Studios in the multi-use plaza (not just a skate park).

12. The following email and concept drawing was received from Mayor Liss.

This was addressed already.

No public comment on items 11 or 12.

A motion was made to approve the above recommendation for Item 11. On motion by Councilmember Scherer, seconded by Councilmember Morillas and passed by voice vote.

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON ISSUES THAT HAVE NOT BEEN DISCUSSED UNDER THE 12 ITEMS.**

Kim Fittke, 4920 King Road, stated the following:

- on page 20, under Opinions, item 3, Ms. Wilson is questioning the use of terms, definitions, and the appendix of the Master Plan and there use throughout the document
- in the document "passive park" is what is referred to as "open space" and Ms. Wilson suggests using passive park instead of open space and she agrees that the use of open space is confusing

Jean Wilson, 4301 Barton Road, stated the following:

- suggested adding a new definition for "agricultural" conservation area in conservation areas
- serious concern about the freeway commercial that it is required to orient toward the creek it is a mistake to prescribe that without any further study
- for a creek to be the focus of a major commercial center could be a mistake to focus that much on it
- possible it could have a lot of public impact, it could impact how people will use that area, she would like to leave that more flexible
- facts could not be included in the charts because they are based by things in the General Plan and suggested perhaps they could be added as a footnote
- for example the charter school can't be added as the list of schools but put it in as a footnote, the Franklin School park can't be added but can be put in as a footnote
- it looks sloppy for the Town to publish a document that doesn't have factual information

Jo-Carol Arisman, 6160 Rachel Lane, stated the following:

- she read the entire document as a proof reader
- on page 6, item 3, it states that we are "plaster County" instead of "Placer County"
- she changed all the errors and gave it to the consultant

Following further discussion on the matter, Council approved the following:


- ask the consultant to review the document and re-consider changing wording from "open space" to "passive park" where it is appropriate
  - on page 48, under Appendix A, 3. Conservation Area - add "agricultural" after the word "cultural" and before "hydrological"
  - on page 43, P-4 (bottom of page), delete the following: "and require the new development to orient itself toward the creek"
- On motion by Councilmember Scherer, seconded by Councilmember Morillas and passed by voice vote.

A motion was made to footnote the charts wherever appropriate to reference the school facilities and any parks for parks and recreation in the area (example King Road Park). On motion by Councilmember Scherer, seconded by Councilmember Morillas and passed by voice vote, with Councilmember Ucovich voting no (4/1).

A motion was made to approve the Edit Section as staff recommended. On motion by Councilmember Morillas, seconded by Councilmember Scherer and passed by voice vote with Councilmember Ucovich voting no (4/1).

## ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made to adjourn at 9:32 p.m. On motion by Councilmember Scherer, seconded by Councilmember Ucovich and passed by voice vote.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Town Clerk